

**USAREUR Support Contract (USC)  
Award Fee Performance Evaluation Reporting Procedures  
&  
End-of-Period Evaluation Notice**

1. Quality Assurance Evaluators (QAE) will submit their prescribed monthly reports as required by the USC Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) and this memorandum to their respective Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO); in turn, the ACO shall consolidate QAE reports in order to render an assessment of contractor quality for Cost-Plus Award Fee (CPAF) work performed during the evaluation period. ACOs shall report this assessment to the AFEB as part of the subjective adjectival rating and numerical score assigned to Performance Factor – Technical Achievement.

1.1. QAE evaluative input to the ACO must comply with the following guidelines:

1.1.1. The **1st paragraph is a simple declarative sentence that states**, "The USAREUR Support Contract Quality Assurance Surveillance Report on Kellogg, Brown & Root Services, Inc. for (Insert Functional Area) for the month of (Insert Month and Year) is assessed to be (Insert Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory) for Timeliness and (Insert Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory) for Quality.

1.1.2. The **second paragraph shall state**, "Based on statistically established observations in accordance with the execution of the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan issued with this contract, the following actions are recommended. These actions may include increased or decreased surveillance levels, ACO/Contractor meeting, issuance of Contractor Discrepancy Report (CDR), or other actions designed to improve contractor performance.

1.1.3. **Additional paragraph(s)** shall cite specific observations and provide supporting justification for consideration by the ACO.

2. Prime Customer Performance Monitors (PCPM) shall render Performance Evaluation Reports (PER). The PERs shall be rendered the following stakeholders:

2.1.1. Area Support Team PER – a consolidated DOL/DPW report that is signed by the Area Support Team Manager

2.1.2. Task Force, G4 PER that is signed by the Task Force Commander or Chief of Staff.

2.1.3. USAREUR Staff:

- 2.1.3.1. ODCS, G1 PER
- 2.1.3.2. ODCS, G4 PER
- 2.1.3.3. ODCSENG PER

2.1.4. Corps of Engineers, Transatlantic Programs Center (CETAC) PER signed by the Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO)

2.1.5. DCAA and DCMA - Corporate Performance Evaluation Reports, as required.

3. The PER shall be in memorandum format addressed to the Chair, USAREUR Support Contract Award Fee Evaluation Board.

3.1. The subject of the memorandum is: ***(Insert: Evaluator or Organization preparing the evaluation)*** USAREUR Support Contract Performance Evaluation Report of Kellogg, Brown & Root Services, Inc for the Performance Period of ***(Insert current period of performance)***.

3.1.1. The **1st paragraph is a simple declarative sentence that states**, "The Overall Performance Evaluation Rating for Kellogg, Brown & Root Services, Inc. for the period of ***(insert period of performance)*** is **(Choose one of the following: Exceptional, Very Good, Good, or Minimally acceptable and below)**.
















3.1.2. **Subsequent paragraphs should state**, "(Selected evaluated Performance Factor) is rated as **(Choose one of the following: Exceptional, Very Good, Good, or Minimally acceptable and below)**." Next, provide supplementary narrative rationalization to support the performance factor rating by citing significant performance evaluation comments and/or recommended areas for improvement.

3.2. Performance Factors prescribed by the USC Award Fee Plan (AFP) are:

- Technical Achievement – The contractor's technical performance and quality of work is assessed to determine if the CPAF work performed meets the technical requirements of the PWS, including a variety of areas of consideration related to how well the work was accomplished.
- Cost Control – The contractor's performance is assessed relative to effectively controlling and/or reducing costs associated with the CPAF work performed. Note that, while important, the evaluation of the contractor's cost control and management cannot be considered in isolation from Technical Achievement and Business Management.

- Business Management – The contractor's performance is assessed to rate the manner in which the Contractor implements contract provisions of the CPAF portion of the contract.

### 3.3. Assignment of Performance Factors:

USC AFEB Primary Monitor Responsibility Matrix									
Monitors:	ACO	PCO	DCMA	DCAA	U'R G4	U'R ENG	U'R G1	TF	AST
Performance Factors	<i>Prime Customer Performance Monitors (PCPM) will evaluate contractor performance per factors assigned below.</i>								
Technical Achievement									
Cost Control									
Business Management									
Note: This matrix can be changed by the AFEB based upon input from PCPMs.									

4. All Award Fee Evaluations shall be transmitted to the Award Fee Evaluation Board (AFEB) Facilitator NLT COB two weeks prior to the AFEB, to allow the AFEB Facilitator to coordinate compiling all reports into an AFEB booklet. Award Fee Evaluation Board packets should be reproduced in black and white; colored printing is not desired.

5. The point of contact is Mr. Lou Martinez, Project Manager/AFEB Facilitator, at Commercial: 540-665-2171, DSN: 312-265-2171, or email: [Louis.C.Martinez@usace.army.mil](mailto:Louis.C.Martinez@usace.army.mil)